



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Beitraege zur Kenntniss der vedischen Schulen, von Dr. RICHARD SIMON.
Kiel, 1889.

The question of the Vedic schools has been treated often, prior to the appearance of this little book: see e. g. Weber, *Indische Studien*, I 149 fg., 289 fg.; III 247 fg.; XIII 430 fg.; *Omina und Portenta*, p. 412 fg.; *Indische Literaturgeschichte*, p. 34 fg., 170, etc.; Max Müller, *Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, p. 371 fg.; Rājendralālamitra in the introduction to the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*, p. 6; Roth, *Der Atharva-Veda in Kaschmir*, p. 24 fg.; Bloomfield, *J. A. O. S.* XI, p. 377-8. The chief native sources for this subject are: 1. The *carapavyūhas*. One, counted as the fifth *pariṣiṣṭa* of the White Yajur-Veda; another figures as the 49th *pariṣiṣṭa* of the AV., dealing with the same subject in shorter form. 2. Incidental mention of school-names in Pāṇini, the *Mahābhāṣya*, and other literature accessory to Pāṇini. 3. The late over-systematic reports of commentators and the *purāṇas*. 4. Incidental mention throughout Vedic literature itself.

Simon's work contains two parts. First an introduction, in which he collects and discusses all that has been said on the subject prior to his own production. As the book is furnished with a good index, the value of this effort cannot be impugned; any given name of a Vedic teacher can with this help be traced back to the texts in which it is mentioned, and the value and scope of the tradition can be controlled. The second part of the work consists in the edition of the introduction to the *Samśkārāganapati* of Rāmākṣṣṇa, which deals almost entirely with the same question. I cannot ascribe to this text any particular value in reference to this question: Rāmākṣṣṇa's knowledge on the subject is derived from the latest stratum of Indian tradition; it stands about on the same level as the reports of a single *purāṇa* on the same point. The liberality with which authors of this sort borrow from any quarter whither their studies may have directed them is well known. To cite one instance we may mention the *śloka*, p. 41: *omkāraṣcā 'thaṣabdaṣ ca dvāv etāu brahmaṇaḥ purā | gaṇḍāu bhittvā viniṣkrāntāu tena māṅgalikāv ubhāu*. Rāmākṣṣṇa says that he has derived this verse from the commentary to a *prātiśākhya*. I have found the verse, with many variants, both in the *bhāṣya* of the Vāj. Prāt. I 17; in the *Tribhāṣyaratna* of the Tāit. Prāt.; in the *Grhyasaṃgraha*, II 9; in Ācāditya's (or Ācārka's) unpublished commentary on the *Karmapradīpa*; in Govindānanda's gloss to Čaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*. It is likely to occur in a dozen or more texts of this sort.

Rāmākṣṣṇa's introduction bears this character throughout. His sources are the very poorest imaginable. I should not consider any name of a Vedic teacher as authentic on his authority merely. He reports, e. g. as the ninth *çākhā*s of the AV. the *pāṭṭipalāḥ*, *dāntāḥ*, *pradāntāḥ*, *tāntāḥ*, *āuntāḥ*, *brahmadābalāḥ*, *çāunakī*, *devīdarçī*, and *caranavidyās*. I shall endeavor to show elsewhere that the statement in reference to this point, made by the *carapavyūha* of the AV., is according to good MSS as follows: *tatra brahmavedasya nava bheda bhavanti tad yathā | pāṭṭipalādās tāudā māudāḥ çāunakiyā jājālā jaladā brahmavedā devadarçī caranavidyāṣ ca*; see Kāuçika-sūtra, introduction, p. xxxii. This statement is shown, *ibid.*, to be correct, because these school-names are known in actual Atharvan literature. The many blundering reports

of this same list, of which Rāmakṛṣṇa's offers a fair specimen, are due to false MS readings, to more or less conscious malformation of these names on the part of later writers, and to later additions.

Clearly, the way to render an ultimately correct account of the Vedic schools will be to rely solely on the reports of the Vedas themselves. Just as the dhātupāṭha has given way to an independent account of Sanskrit roots, derived from the language itself, so must the future account of Vedic teachers and other celebrities ignore the over-systematic, garbled collections of late texts.

Simon's work is done with excellent judgment and great care as to every detail. There is evident promise of valuable work in the future in this, his first effort.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.